



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9/n
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,084	02/14/2001	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1080 (JDH)	9826

21171 7590 10/04/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

LEE, SEUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,084

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Seung H Lee

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7 June 2002 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day et al (US 6,243,722)(hereinafter referred to as 'Day') in view of Yu (US 5,433,483).

Day teaches a document review system or review tool (200) having an Internet connection wherein the Internet connected a network and performing communication with other devices, memory units (i.e., document source, comment database, etc.), a server-side review application serves (224) as a determination unit, a storing control unit, and creating unit in which the determines content of a reviewed form reviewed by user/reviewer, and store the comment of document reviewed by reviewer in the memory

(226), create new file contains the comment of the document reviewed by reviewer, a review button (140) serves as a notification unit to notify the plurality of reviews that a reviewed form to be reviewed is stored in the first memory (218), a mail interface (150) serves as a transmission unit having a predetermined format and address information (i.e., e-mail recipient address) to transmit information to the identified address information, a display, an input unit (a keyboard and a mice) (see Figs. 1-9; col. 8, line 40-col. 9, line 24).

However, Day fails to teach or fairly suggest that the review system creating a single review result.

Yu teaches the creating a single review result or a monthly statement having a statistical data format such as a bar chart form and/or a pie chart form (see Fig. 8-13; col. 7, line 1- col. 8, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the statistical data as taught by Yu to the part of comment data as taught by Day in order to present the graphical presentation by retrieving the statistical data from the comments data. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the method of creating review result based on the time period (i.e., having a counter function in the program) such as monthly as taught by Yu to the review system of Day in order to create the review result when the counter reached a predetermined number in which is set by operator(s), that is, user(s) or operator(s) can choose the frequency of creating the review result, creating a review result in once a week, creating a review

result in once a month, creating a review result when every ten evaluations/comments have been received, creating a review result when every hundreds of evaluations/comments have been received, etc.

Although, Day as modified by Yu teach the document review system having a statistical data, they fails to teach or fairly suggest that the document review system having a second display to display a graph based on the statistical data, it would have been an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to designate one of the client system (92) to download the information regarding the particular document from the comments database (226) instead of downloading the reviewable html document from the html document provider (218) in order to display the result of the evaluations/comments, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that "*a creating unit creates a single review result information based on the collected evaluations and/or comments when a predetermined number of evaluations and/or comments have been stored in said memory unit*" (see page 6, line 1+), the Examiner respectfully provides Day and Yu references wherein Day as modified by Yu teach to create a single review result as discussed in paragraph 3 above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure;

Everingham [US 6,327,611], Hajmiragha [US 6,289,460], and Evans [US 5,999,925], disclose a document management system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Seung H. Lee** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.


If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax-phone number for this group is (703) 308-5841 or (703) 308-7722.


Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [**michael.lee@uspto.gov**].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


Seung H. Lee
Art Unit 2876
September 21, 2002


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER/2800